

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

JAIME LUEVANO,

Plaintiff,

vs.

EL PASO TEXAS CORRUPTIONS, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:10-cv-00784-GMN-LRL

ORDER

On August 17, 2010, the court issued an order denying plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* because plaintiff has "struck out" pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) (docket #3). On August 27, 2010, the order served on plaintiff was returned by the U.S. Postal Service as undeliverable, and was re-mailed because in the interim plaintiff had filed a motion that reflected a new address (*see* docket #4). However, the order served on plaintiff was again returned by the U.S. Postal Service as undeliverable (*see* docket #5). Pursuant to Rule 2-2 of the Local Rules of Special Proceedings and Appeals, a *pro se* litigant is required to keep the court apprised of his or her current address at all times. Local Rule 2-2 states: "The plaintiff shall immediately file with the court written notification of any change of address. The notification must include proof of service upon each opposing party or the party's attorney. Failure to comply with this rule may result in dismissal of the action with prejudice." Accordingly, as plaintiff has failed to file written notification of change of address with the court, this action is dismissed.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that this action is **DISMISSED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for writ of mandamus (docket #2) is **DENIED** as moot.

1 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk shall enter judgment accordingly and close
2 this case.

3 DATED this 20th day of September, 2010.

4
5 
6 _____
7 Gloria M. Navarro
8 United States District Court
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26